

Let's work together for a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM, NOT AN IMMIGRANT PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Russell) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kevin Porteus, professor at Hillsdale College, made an interesting observation in his excellent study, "Immigration and the American Founding":

America's immigration problem is not with immigrants, but with Americans. In order for the Founders' policies to be intelligible and effective, America must return to the Founders' principles of justice. If America is not based on those principles, then it is like the other nations, and the idea of America as an asylum becomes muddled and incoherent. If we accept feudal obligation and its modern incarnation, birthright citizenship, then the ideas of government by consent and the right to emigrate become obscured. If we forget that consent is reciprocal and that the purpose of government is to protect the inalienable natural rights of its citizens, then the right and duty to restrict immigration and naturalization becomes nothing but an expression of racism and nativism. If we forget our heritage as a refuge for the virtuous and oppressed of the world, then we lose a significant part of what makes America exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an immigration expert. I do, however, know and love the history of our great Republic. I speak before America, not as a member of any party, but as an American who has nearly given my life on multiple battlefields in defense of her Constitution. As such, I am disturbed at the abandonment of principle by both sides of the aisle, the acceptance of sound bites in lieu of facts, and the framing of popular, even if opposing sentiments that are used to leverage political power.

In our national immigration debate, we suffer much bitter contention, with political power being used to divide America on her foundations in the hopes that one side may force the other into its will. But what of it? What if we had no respect for the law? What if we closed the door to the poor and wretched masses? What if we had no security on our borders? What if we allowed privileged classes to have distinction in immigration? Either side prevailing on such a course would end the great experiment of liberty and equality among mankind as embodied in the very fabric of our Nation.

And with all the critique about the use of Biblical passages to support various views on immigration, how about this one from Proverbs 29:12 that can be leveled against both sides of our national government:

If a ruler pays attention to lies, all his servants become wicked.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Porteus is correct that America's immigration problem is

not with immigrants, but with Americans. We should take his counsel to examine how a people bound by liberty and equality, rather than birthright and obligation, should govern themselves and accommodate those seeking the same.

Our Founders were driven by the premise that all are created equal, endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In that vein, they categorically rejected the notion of obligation to government or servitude to landholders simply by the happenstance of one's birth.

Washington framed it simply, but effectively: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct, they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Thomas Jefferson conveyed it along these lines:

If an individual chooses to depart from the regime of his birth and to associate with a new one, he has an inherent right to do so.

Jefferson, in his first address to Congress, put it this way: "Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress . . . hospitality . . . ? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? . . . Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us."

To redress the dilemma of various States creating a patchwork of standards for who should be allowed or not allowed as immigrants, the framers of the Constitution settled the issue by granting Congress the power to "establish a uniform naturalization rule."

Enjoying the fruit of such immigration policy, the French-born immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, in his "Letters from an American Farmer" praised the political liberty and economic prosperity of America, saying: "Europe contains hardly any other distinctions but lords and tenants; this fair country alone is settled by freeholders, the possessors of the soil they cultivate, members of the government they obey, and the framers of their own laws, by means of their representatives . . . It is here that the idle may be employed, the useless become useful, and the poor become rich."

The first Federal naturalization law passed by this Congress under the Constitution required 2 years' residency in the United States, 1 year's residency in the State he was applying for citizenship, an oath of loyalty, and as an indication of the times, rather than many of the framers' expressed wishes, that the applicant be a free white person. Subsequent statutes increased the

length of time to as much as 14 years, but by 1802, Congress settled on the 5-year residency requirement that persists to this day. No other restrictions were imposed. No incentives or encouragements by class were instituted.

Later, Congress abolished the immigration slave trade in 1808 and further eliminated the notion of class structure with the Passenger Act of 1819 to end indentured servitude immigration. It would take another 50 years to secure the rights of all men under the law, but the steady efforts of many were realized without any alteration of the framers' original principles. After the Civil War, the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Amendments simply and rightly applied those principles to all Americans, naturally born, freed, or naturalized.

American anathema to class distinction guided her well in the first century, culminating with the Civil War, as all men truly became equal under the law along the framework of the Founders' principles. Rejected was an obligation to government by birth, but rather, the American ideal was to voluntarily consent to government by choice. This ideal in its purist sense was upheld until the 1898 Supreme Court decision *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* which somewhat returned the feudalistic citizenship by birthright contrary to the views of many of the Founders. While doing good in securing certain rights for certain individuals, it also set up the construct to eliminate the rights of those not naturally born who wished to associate as law abiding immigrants by choice.

American immigration historically has largely been driven by world events. Prior to the Great Depression and World War II, annual immigration comprised .64 of 1 percent of the United States population, with spikes as high as 1.61 percent. Immigrants expanded the country, cultivated the fields, spiked the railroads, and laid the cities across the Nation. By the time we entered the First World War in 1917, fully one-third of the Nation's population had been born overseas or had a parent who was an immigrant. A full 20 percent of the doughboys we sent to France in World War I were not even born in the United States, fighting to secure our liberty and also a new place in the world in what became an American century.

Immigration dropped sharply due to economics, fear, and war with the Great Depression and World War II, but migrant workers still came by the hundreds of thousands during the war. Laborers from Mexico and Central America entered the agricultural fields and farms as we fed our armies and ourselves.

An inseparable bond between agriculture and the guest worker resulted in demand for farm workers and industrial labor during the war. The United States Government recognized this with the Bracero accord that allowed for these workers to come annually to

meet a crisis during the war and a vibrant economic growth thereafter.

Succumbing to fears about uncapped workers in our fields and farms or on our machines at home, this Congress ended the Bracero accord in 1964. And with the institution of new immigration caps in 1965, an almost immediate spike in illegal immigration rose as seasonal workers, with no guarantee that they would make the next season's quota, stayed instead. The problem became so bad, that Congress again struggled with what to do and by 1986, took a stab at accommodating those that some argued would have likely been citizens at normal immigration rates in exchange for strengthening our southern border. We only got the immigrants when both were sorely needed.

Now we are here today. Only .32 percent of our population are immigrants arriving annually. That is markedly lower than when we were fighting the Civil War. While the agricultural industry and the housing and construction industries are symbiotically entwined, we instead address immigration issues separate from what used to be handled under the Bracero accord.

□ 1845

And while the economic drivers are pulling immigrants to seek a better life in our country, we, in turn, will restrict already small percentages of our population to even smaller ones, despite the fact that our unemployment numbers are lower than our job openings for the first time in American history.

What could we do? Some low-hanging fruit would be to secure our border and to provide some type of permanent residency for minors known as DACA recipients to address the immediate need. A bipartisan majority could readily vote for such a clean measure. Then, once that is done, we can establish a uniform naturalization rule to address further issues.

Yet the solutions offered to us this week, instead, are to demonize family migration, accommodate only those with some station in life or those able to pay a million bucks to get a permanent residency and, thus, end the hopes of those wishing to come here legally with an already reduced system.

We have many claims floating around these august Chambers. Here are some of them:

Immigrants are taking our jobs;

Immigrants are destroying our American way of life with chain migration;

We are flooded by a wave of illegal and legal immigration unlike any time in our Nation's history.

Here's the reality: The percentage of native-born workers to fuel our construction and agricultural economies do not exist. We can either import workers or we can import our food.

In a study published in 2013, economist Michael Clemens did a 15-year analysis of data on North Carolina's farm labor market, concluding there is

virtually no supply of native manual farm laborers in the State. This was true even in the depths of a severe recession.

In 2011, with 6,500 available farm jobs in the State, only 268 of nearly half a million unemployed North Carolinians applied for those jobs. More than 90 percent of them—a whopping 245 people—of those applying, were hired, but just 163 even showed up for the first day's work. Only seven native workers completed the entire growing season, filling only one-tenth of 1 percent of the open farm jobs.

This is not an abnormality. Since World War II, migrant workers have fueled America as the breadbasket of the globe. That may change. As I stated, we can either import workers or we can import food.

The problem with the workforce may be even deeper than we know. In 2017, according to the Centers for Disease Control, there were about 60 births per 1,000 women ages 15 to 44, which is 3 percent lower than the rate in 2016 and the lowest recorded rate of birth since the government started tracking birth rates in 1909.

Our actual birth rate is now 1.84. A nation must have at least a 2.1 birth rate to sustain itself. Plus, we abort about 1.2 to 1.5 million children a year. We immigrate approximately 1 million people a year, and many of those have children. If one were to subtract the 39 million immigrants in our population since Roe v. Wade, our actual birth rate would even be lower. As in the past, immigrants are sustaining our national growth in spite of ourselves, and just barely.

The issue of family immigration, now demonized as chain migration, was originally conceived as a way to ensure immigrants arriving had a support base structure, negating or reducing the need for government assistance. It has largely achieved that aim. Now, if current proposals become law, instead of acquiring a more stable and skilled workforce, the opposite is likely to occur, as it did before family migration was instituted.

And what of this dastardly diversity lottery? Is it the "diversity" name that offends us?

The reality is the diversity lottery visas ensure immigrants come from a wide spectrum of nations rather than just those south of the border.

Further, a study published just a couple of months ago showed that diversity lottery recipients and family migrants, far from being unskilled and ignorant, are actually better educated than naturally born citizens. The study showed that 47 percent had a college degree or higher, as compared to 29 percent of the naturally born American population.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we could use more of this type of ignorance and lack of skill.

Americans of all generations have had concerns about immigrants: Irish, Dutch, German, Chinese, Eastern Euro-

pean, Mexican, Vietnamese, Persian, Lebanese, Syrian. We fret over language, even though studies show second-generation Americans are fully engaged linguistically, and third-generation Americans speak virtually nothing of their old tongue.

In our current national debate, immigrants south of the border carry such worrisome traits as strong in their faith, close-knit families, hardworking, and small business entrepreneurs. As a conservative, it sounds a lot like the things that I stand for. As an American, it sounds a lot like the America I fought for.

Immigrants of all stripes have defended this country with their lives. Forty percent of the soldiers I lost in Iraq were immigrants or had immigrating parents. One was not even a citizen but earned his citizenship posthumously.

While our Nation has ever been sustained by immigrants defending their newfound freedom along with ours, we must reject a dangerous proposal creeping into the immigration measures on this floor, namely, that non-permanent residents can earn a residency by military service.

Now, we have long accommodated permanent residents to earn their citizenship, but to place people with no status or allegiance into uniform makes us no better than a foreign legion or, worse, a Roman legion.

The Statue of Liberty does not wear a blindfold. That is reserved for Lady Justice. Ms. Justice must continue to hold her scales in balance, with the laws of Americans on one hand balanced by those seeking citizenship to also, themselves, be law-abiding in pursuit of a new citizenship.

Americans are not flooded by immigrants. We are well below the norm, historically. We are, however, starved by restrictive, unaccommodating policy that meets neither the lamp lit by our Founders nor the economic engines needing hands to turn them.

Lady Liberty must continue to raise her arm and keep her torch burning brightly rather than exchange it for a stiff arm and a middle finger. The words inscribed at her base must not say "Send me only your physicians, your scientists, and your Nobel laureates."

If we use our passions, anger, and fear to snuff out liberty's flame by xenophobic and knee-jerk policies, the enemies of liberty win, and what makes America exceptional dies, period.

We have so lost our way on immigration that we even have those across our land rejecting those fleeing tyranny. I want you to listen carefully to these statements by Members of Congress in response to a refugee bill—not illegals, not permanent residents, but refugees, people fleeing for their lives. Listen to these statements by Members of Congress:

Fighting immigration is “the best vote-getting argument . . . The politician can beat his breast and proclaim his loyalty to America.”

“He can tell the unemployed man he is out of work because some alien has his job.”

Here’s another one. Congress must “protect the youth of America from this foreign invasion.”

And how about this one? “American children have first claim to America’s charity.”

There are many more, but these quotes were from 1939. The refugee bill was not for Muslim and Christian Syrians or Iraqi Muslims, Christians, and Yazidis. It was for German and Eastern European Jews. Namely, it was for 20,000 children whom they were trying to receive into the country.

Not only could we not allow 20,000 Jewish children to enter our country in 1939, that same Congress, with the same speech and rhetoric I am hearing in recent days in this august Chamber, passed hurdle after hurdle to make it more difficult for those refugees and immigrants to enter our country.

See the gap during that time? They were, unfortunately, successful.

Mr. Speaker, America protects her liberty and defends her shores not by punishing those who would be free. She does it by guarding liberty with her life. Americans need to sacrifice and wake up. We must not become enemies of the very liberty in the fabric of our Republic. The enemies of liberty win if we give up who we are and, even more so, without a fight.

We guard our way of life by vigilance. We must be watchful. We have to have each other’s back as Americans, not as Republicans and Democrats. By maintaining who we are amidst the threat, amidst the hatred, amidst the trials, we win.

Patrick Henry did not say: “Give me safety and economy or give me death.” He said: “Give me liberty.”

We have defended our way of life for roughly 240 years. Now we as Americans must defend it again. We must defend it when the critic sitting on the couch eating his bag of cheese puffs is pecking out hatred and vitriol. We must defend it and have courage when voters are caught up with sincere passion, demanding security that might kill our liberty based on facts that are not true. We must defend it with our warriors who have worked hard to keep the fight for freedom off of our shores.

We will always have threats to security and economy, but liberty, when lost, takes generations, if ever, to regain.

Will and Ariel Durant, those epic recorders of human history, wrote this warning: “Civilization is not inherited; it has to be learned and earned by each generation anew; if the transmission should be interrupted . . . civilization would die, and we should be savages again.”

I am asking all Americans to please pray for this Congress and specifically

for our President. How much time have we really spent on our knees at home for our leaders, regardless of what we think of them? How much counsel have we sought from the Almighty?

It is God who has given us the spark of freedom. It is God we must return to. He will take us and guide us in times of crisis if only we ask Him and humble ourselves and seek His face as a nation.

The Apostle James instructs us:

If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all liberally and without reproach, and it will be given to him.

Mr. Speaker, maybe our lack of doing that is how we got here in the first place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 10 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4760, SECURING AMERICA’S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-770) on the resolution (H. Res. 952) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6136, BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-771) on the resolution (H. Res. 953) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4760, SECURING AMERICA’S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 115-772) on the resolution (H. Res. 954) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 2018, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

5231. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the Department’s Inventory of Contracted Services FY 2017 final report is expected to be submitted to Congress by the end of September 2018, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a(c)(1); Public Law 107-107, Sec. 801(c)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 812); (130 Stat. 2269); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5232. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s report to Congress on Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for Fiscal Year 2019, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2228(e)(1); Public Law 107-314, Sec. 1067(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 954(a)(1)); (130 Stat. 2376); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5233. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council’s 2017 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5234. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Removal of Cross References to Previously Removed Appendices and Subpart [Docket No.: FR-6102-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD88) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5235. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Revision to the Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management [Docket No.: 180131107-8107-01] (RIN: 0660-AA35) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5236. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Unexploded Ordnance Detonation, Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0531] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the